

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS
THE GENERIC NAME *SOUTHERNIA* FILIPJEV, 1927. Z.N.(S.) 940.
(See volume 17, pages 86-88.)

By William G. Inglis (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

The taxonomic study of the free-living Nematoda is still in its infancy and it is very doubtful if it is desirable to place any generic names of such a group on the Official Lists or Indexes. For example Case 1 refers to the genus *Southernia* which (sensu Allgén, 1929) contains only three (or four) species all of which have been referred to in the literature on very few occasions. The obvious way of treating such a case where there is no clear evidence of there being any "stability" to worry about is to re-name it. The name has only existed for a little over thirty years, is not widespread in the literature and I oppose any action being taken on this proposal. The placing of the name *Rhabdodemania* Baylis and Daubney, 1926 on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology and of the name *Demania* Southern, 1914 on the List of Rejected and Invalid Names appears to be unnecessary since their status is clear and as a matter of general principle I would object to the cluttering up of the Official Lists with such names. I therefore oppose any action being taken on them.

Case 2.

I can see no advantage in placing the generic name *Parasphaerolaimus* Ditlevsen, 1918 on the Official List of Generic Names since (1) there is no question as to its type-species; (2) there is no evidence that it is a junior homonym and needs to be protected for purposes of stability; (3) whether it is recognized as a genus or not is a taxonomic matter and at present *Parasphaerolaimus* is not accepted as a distinct genus, although I would agree that there are reasons for treating it as distinct, this is a matter of taxonomic judgment and not nomenclature, so that we have the position where the name of a not generally accepted genus is proposed for a place on the Official Lists; (4) I do not understand the last remark in the case "...", and the latter (i.e. *Parasphaerolaimus*) ought to be preserved as the generic name of the species *paradoxus* Ditlevsen, 1918." Clearly if the species *paradoxus* is considered to be generically distinct the name of its genus must be *Parasphaerolaimus*. If other species should be included with it in the same genus and one of these should be the type-species of an earlier generic name *Parasphaerolaimus* would become a junior synonym and I cannot see that this would lead to any instability in nomenclature since the name *Parasphaerolaimus* has only been used twice as far as I can find out. On the other hand the other generic name, presupposing that such a name existed, might be older and more generally used than *Parasphaerolaimus* but it would have to fall into synonymy. In effect the placing of the name *Parasphaerolaimus* on the Official List has nothing to commend it but such an action could produce nomenclatorial instability through the Commission being invited to legislate in the dark. I oppose this proposal. The placing of *Sphaerolaimus* Bastian, 1865 on the Official List of Generic Names can only have been proposed to cover the eventuality that it might have to be suppressed in favour of *Parasphaerolaimus* if the latter name were placed on the Official List and if other authors continued to persist in not treating *Parasphaerolaimus* as a genus distinct from *Sphaerolaimus*. If both the proposals are accepted the nomenclatorial position would not be altered since *Parasphaerolaimus* would simply go into and come out of synonymy with *Sphaerolaimus* as is already the case. This case should be rejected. I oppose it.

Case 3.

This is a simple case where the application of the Rules has made the nomenclatorial position perfectly clear. Allgén suggests that the valid names should be placed on the Lists "... to prevent further confusion". There does not appear to be any chance of confusion and I would oppose action being taken on this case. Further it is doubtful if such action in a group as poorly known as the free-living Nematoda has anything to commend it, on the grounds of either convenience or stability.